

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

New claim 27 is added herein. Claims 1-11, 16-22 and 27 are pending and under consideration.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112:

Initially, it is noted that a telephonic interview was conducted between the Examiner and the Applicant's representative on April 6, 2006 with respect to divisional application number 10/865,872. The Examiner is thanked for her time. Pursuant to the interview, "place of installation" replaces "position." Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103:

Using independent claim 1 as an example, this claim recites that when the second computer is connected to the network circuit through any one of said connecting means, the resource setting means receives the hardware or software information and directly sets the hardware or software. As previously noted, the gateway computer 15 or workstation 18 must be connected to the network 12 via the connector that is in the same room, because the walls 13 are opaque. Thus, the second computer is not connected through "any one" of the connecting means.

The Examiner states that the connector in the same room qualifies as "any one" of the connectors. The Examiner appears to use "any one" in a different context than is claimed. Instead, the Examiner appears to examine the claims as if they recited "one" of the connecting means, without considering the term "any."

Independent claim 1 further recites a computer network system in which plural connecting means capable of connecting and disconnecting a computer is provided in a network circuit to which a first computer has been connected, and a second computer is connected to one of said connecting means.

The Examiner relies upon column 6, lines 12-28 and 41-45 of Weiser as disclosing the first and second computers. Office Action, p.3, ln. 4-7. These portions refer to a network 12, a plurality of stationary workstations 18 connected to the network 12, and gateway computers 15 for wireless connection to the network 12. Thus, the Examiner is relying upon one of the

gateway computer 15 or workstation 18 as corresponding to the first computer, and the other of the gateway computer 15 or workstation 18 as corresponding to the second computer.

However, the workstation 18 is an example of a resource, as described at column 7, lines 21-25 of Weiser. The gateway computer 15 translates a signal between the wireless communication from a transceiver and the communication packets sent over network 12. Weiser, col. 6, ln. 42-46.

The Examiner also relies upon column 7, lines 65-67 and column 8, lines 1-4 as teaching the claimed features regarding the second computer being connected through any one of the plural connecting units. This portion relates to the architecture of the room agent 48. The room agent 48 resides on one or more processors coupled to the network, and is not disclosed as being on the gateway computer 15 or the workstation 18. Weiser, col. 7, ln. 46-47. Thus, there appears to be an inconsistency in the Examiner's position. Specifically, the Examiner first relies upon the gateway computer 15 or workstation 18 as corresponding to the claimed first or second computer, and then relies upon the room agent 48 as corresponding to the second computer.

Alternatively, if the Examiner relies upon the mobile controllers 24, 26 of Weiser as corresponding to the claimed second computer, then the room agent 48 would correspond to the first computer. However, there is no teaching that the mobile controllers 24, 26 directly set the hardware.

It is also noted that Weiser does not teach that the second computer directly sets the hardware, as claimed. The Examiner relies upon column 11, lines 35-46 of Weiser. However, this portion teaches the function of the room agent and the resource agent, not the resource setting means of the second computer.

Based on the above, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

NEW CLAIM

New claim 27 depends from claim 1 and is added herein.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is

requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

By:


Michael J. Badagliacca
Registration No. 39,099

Date: 4 14 2006

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700

Washington, D.C. 20005

Telephone: (202) 434-1500

Facsimile: (202) 434-1501